

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**STATE BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES**

***Policy and Evaluation Committee***

November 30, 2010

Williamsburg, Virginia

**Members Present:** Ruth Jarvis (Chair), Gretta Doering, Andrew Goddard, Bob Hendrickson, Anand Pandurangi.

**Members Absent:** None.

**Staff Present:** Ruth Anne Walker, Paul Gilding, Mary Clair O'Hara; by phone – Neila Gunter and Sue Ridout.

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by Ruth Jarvis, Chair.

**II. Welcome**

Ruth Jarvis welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**III. Adoption of Policy and Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2010**

Committee members reviewed and approved the minutes for the September meeting.

**IV. Revised Draft (from Staff) and Discussion**

The following two policies were distributed for initial field review and comment from August 6 to September 10, 2010. Since that time, staff worked internally to make edits to combine the two policies and otherwise update them. Ms. Gunter led the committee through the reasons for the edits thus far. She reported on the importance of the system's workforce and how over time it has evolved from somewhat 'siloed' positions in either behavioral health or intellectual disability areas to a blending of competencies across disability areas. There has also been a shift to the value of experience coupled with education, moving away from dominant reliance on education, which supports the principles and evidenced-based practices associated with peer support. She referenced the focus in recent years on concepts of both 'high performing organizations' and 'recovery' and 'person-centered planning.' Ms. Gunter also explained the department's established council on workforce issues and its role.

Ms. O'Hara stated that the revised draft incorporates the important pieces of the current Policy 3002 and blends the clinical training with the other department training by the Office of Human Resources. She reported on the use of the LMS online training system that currently has approximately 7,000 internal and 4,000 external users. Training is also done via video-conferencing.

➤ Policy 1028(SYS)90-1 *Human Resource Development*

- Policy 3002(CO)86-16 *System-wide Staff Training* (to be combined into 1028)

Staff indicated the title of the combined policy should have been changed in the current draft from '*Human Resource*' Development to '*Workforce*' Development. Staff noted Mrs. Jarvis' edit to the current revised draft on page 2, to change the phrase 'ensure that *talented* individuals are recruited' to use a term such as '*competent*' in order to use a word based more in professional training and ability versus inherent ability.

## **V. First Review and Discussion Review and Discussion**

Mr. Gilding gave the committee a background review of the development of these two current policies. First, regarding Policy 6002, the current policy is fairly straightforward in addressing the idea that services should not be denied to people who cannot pay for them. However, this is a sensitive policy from an administrative standpoint. Staff recommends revision of the policy but will.....?

Mr. Goddard wondered about referrals by community services boards (CSBs) to individuals not able to receive services to either the local *pro bono* program and/or free clinics. Mr. Gilding responded that each CSB would have that information for referral, but it was not as needed anymore because of the Medicaid system. Mr. Goddard asked for clarification on the mechanism to determine an individual's ability to pay, and Mr. Gilding referenced a portion of the Performance Contract. Dr. Hendrickson asked if consumers of services are able to provide input on the eligibility criteria and Mr. Gilding stated that some CSBs likely seek such input. Mr. Gilding asked members to keep in mind the difference between 'eligibility' and 'ability to pay.'

In regard to Policy 6005, Mr. Gilding stated that this policy was drafted as a result of a previous assistant commissioner suggesting some simplification of the process for CSBs to report on unspent balances. Mr. Gilding shared a handout with an excerpt from the Performance Contract and the additional appendix in the CSB Administrative Requirements document. As a result of the State Balances Work Group, *Appendix C: Unspent Balances Principles and Procedures* was added to the CSB Administrative Requirements for FY 2011. It includes the substance of the state board policy on retention of state balances. In light of the language now included in the Performance Contract, it may be that this policy is no longer needed. Mr. Pandurangi noted that it would be difficult to keep monitor how the balances were spent unless Central Office staff had access to all of the financial files, and Mrs. Jarvis concurred and thought the process would be very time consuming for staff. Mr. Gilding noted that the language in the Performance Contract represents agreement among all the CSBs on this issue.

- Policy 6002 (FIN)86-14 *Services Availability and Ability of Client Pay Philosophy*
- Policy 6005 (FIN)94-2 *Retention of Unspent State Funds by Community Services Boards*

## **VI. Next Steps: April 28, 2010**

A final revised draft combining the two workforce policies will be available for committee review. The two policies listed under V. will be put out for initial field review

and comment the last week of February . An update on the status of the definitions related to Developmental Services (including autism) will be given, including any changes from the 2011 General Assembly Session.

**VI. Scheduled Review Matrix**

Staff referred members to the Review Matrix in the packet.

**VII. Adjournment**

The next meeting of the committee will be on April 28, 2010 at a location to be determined, unless the comments received over the late winter/early spring warrant another meeting prior to that date.